

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 1-2 have been amended to obviate the examiner's objections thereto and/or to further clarify the concepts of the present invention. In addition, claims 3-20 including non-elected claims 4-8 and 10-20 have been canceled and claims 21 through 24 have been added. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications directed to the subject matter of the non-elected claims. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 9 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite. In particular, the position taken in this rejection apparently was that (1) the two noted phrases describing the side electrode in claim 1 were structurally unclear; (2) the recitation in claim 2 was vague; and (3) the phrase relating to the "sum of the depths" was unclear. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

In response, the claims have been amended to address each of the above items (1)-(3). It is submitted that the claims are now in accordance with the provisions of the cited statute. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over, the cited patent to Yokotani et al. In making this rejection, the position apparently was that the cited patent teaches a laminated ceramic substrate of ceramic sheets and conductive layers as claimed where the terminal electrodes 8 are laminated at two ends of the laminated body and electrically connect with the conductive layers. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

Before discussing the rejection in detail, a brief review of the presently claimed invention may be quite instructive. The laminated ceramic substrate as presently claimed is formed by laminating ceramic layers, and further includes a side electrode comprising a side edge electrode layer that is formed on each ceramic layer and overlaps with and connects to a side edge electrode layer formed on another ceramic layer directly above and/or directly below an adjacent ceramic layer. Each side edge electrode layer is positioned within a through hole as is shown, for example, in FIG. 1(a), in the ceramic substrate, the through hole bounded by a side surface of the laminated ceramic substrate. The ceramic layers are not rectangular in overall shape because of the through hole. It is submitted that such a laminated ceramic substrate is not taught or suggested by the cited patent to Yokotani et al.

More particularly, the Yokotani et al discloses a device having rectangular ceramic layers without a through hole. Specifically, the terminal electrodes 8 as relied upon in the rejection are drawn out the respective conductive layers and, as shown in Figure 1B, are on the exterior of the ceramic laminate and thus are not positioned as is presently claimed. Thus, it is submitted that the ceramic substrate as taught in the cited Yokotani et al patent can be distinguished from the substrate as presently claimed.

For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1-2 and 21-24 over the cited patent are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over, the cited patent to Piper et al. In making this rejection, it was asserted that the cited patent teaches a laminated ceramic substrate of ceramic sheets and conductive layers as claimed where the terminal or external electrodes are metallization coatings 17 and 18 formed onto the end faces of the ceramic laminate as shown in Fig. 3. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

As to this rejection, it is submitted that basically the same considerations as were set forth above relative to the Yokotani et al patent are applicable to this patent as well. That is, it is submitted that the cited Piper et al patent fails to teach a side electrode structure as presently claimed which is within the laminated ceramic substrate. Among other things, the terminal structure as shown in Fig. 3 of the patent is external to the laminate. Thus, it is submitted that the ceramic substrate as taught in the cited Piper et al patent can be distinguished from the substrate as presently claimed.

For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1-2 and 21-24 over the cited patent are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Serial Number: 10/541,494


OA dated 1/3/07

Amdt. dated 4/3/07

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the undersigned hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Donald W. Hanson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,133

Atty. Docket No. 050333
Suite 1000, 1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930
DWH/rab



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE